


004901

JAN 20 1987

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

**REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF
HAMILTON - WENTWORTH
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
SETTLEMENT CAPABILITY STUDY
FOR
THE WOODBURN AREA**

Underwood McLellan Ltd.



Underwood McLellan Ltd.

89 Carlingview Drive
Rexdale (Toronto), Ontario M9W 5E4
Telephone (416) 675-6484

July 16, 1980

File #1931-020

Mr. Joachim L. Schwarz, M.C.I.P.
Senior Planner
Regional Planning Division
Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth
100 Main Street East
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 1G8

Dear Mr. Schwarz,

Re: Woodburn


We are pleased to submit 50 copies of the final report and plan completed in accordance with the project's terms of reference.

It has been concluded that Woodburn should not be extensively developed due to the presence of a shallow water table, very low soil permeability rates and the extensive amount of land within the flood areas of Twenty Mile Creek.

We trust you will find this submission to be satisfactory.

Yours very truly,

UNDERWOOD McLELLAN LTD.



Karl Reichert, P. Eng.,
Director, Environmental Engineering &
Assistant Branch Manager

KR:sd
Encl.

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

REGION OF HAMILTON-WENTWORTH
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL PLAN DIVISION

"SETTLEMENT CAPABILITY STUDY"

FOR THE

WOODBURN AREA

UNDERWOOD McLELLAN LTD.

JULY 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Preface</u>	
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 PURPOSE	1
3.0 LOCATION	2
4.0 FIELD PROGRAM	2
5.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION	4
5.1 Bedrock	4
5.2 Soils	4
5.3 Topography	4
5.4 Surface Drainage	4
5.5 Groundwater	5
5.6 Alternative Methods of Sewage Disposal	7
6.0 CONCLUSIONS	8
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	9
APPENDIX A Study Terms of Reference	
APPENDIX B Introductory Letter From Region of Hamilton-Wentworth and Signed Permission Forms	
APPENDIX C Borehole Information - Sites 1-7 Percolation Test Results - Sites 1-7	
APPENDIX D Summary Description of Existing Wells - Woodburn Study Area	
APPENDIX E Alternative On-Site Systems	
APPENDIX F Figure 1 (Enclosed at Back of Report)	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Soil Units, Slopes, Surface Drainage,
Twenty Mile Creek (Draft) Regional Floodline,
Soil and Percolation Test Hole Locations

LIST OF TABLES

Follows Page

Table 1	Summary of Water Supply and Waste Disposal Survey	3
Table 2	Summary of Bacteriological Examination and Chemical Analysis of Water Samples	3

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth has identified the need for additional rural development. In 1975 and 1976, twenty-eight settlement areas in the Region were evaluated to determine general terrain conditions, means of water supply and methods of sewage disposal. That preliminary study, completed by Underwood McLellan Ltd., established a potential development population for each settlement based on the provision of available water and the suitability of the soils for private on-site sewage disposal facilities.

In 1979, the Region indicated that two of the original twenty-eight study areas, Freelon and Woodburn, were to be the subjects of a more detailed assessment to determine if more residential development could be permitted and where it should be allowed in each of these villages. The following report examines the development capability of Woodburn. The terms of reference for this study are included in Appendix A.

2.0 Purpose

The purpose of the study is to determine the ultimate size of development which could safely be supported in Woodburn on the basis of individual private wells and septic tanks and tile field disposal systems. Communal wells and other economically and environmentally acceptable sewage disposal systems, or a combination of these are an alternative consideration for supporting any future development.

3.0 LOCATION

The study area surrounding the village of Woodburn is located in the Township of Glanbrook (formerly the Township of Binbrook) in the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth. Located 1 3/4 miles south of Highway 20, the settlement is centred along Regional Road 34, Woodburn Road. The study area comprises Parts of Lots 3-5, Block 1, Concession 1 and 2, and Parts of Lots 1-3, Block 2, Concession 1 and 2, Township of Glanbrook.

The limits of the study area were selected to include a significant area of land around the intersection of Golf Club Road and Woodburn Road which was chosen as the centroid of the community.

4.0 FIELD PROGRAM

Once the boundaries of the study area had been established, the lands were analyzed by air photo interpretation in conjunction with soils and agricultural base maps to establish the various land units represented in and around Woodburn. Test holes were located and drilled to determine the soil and groundwater characteristics of the lands under investigation. Their locations are shown on Figure 1.

An introductory letter from the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth explaining the study was mailed to each of the land owners on February 15, 1980 where a test hole was proposed to be located. Copies of this letter and the accompanying permission forms are contained in Appendix B. A questionnaire was prepared to obtain information on the water supply and waste disposal systems currently in use by representative property owners. Where no residence was situated on the property, neighbours were contacted. Door to door interviews were conducted between March 18, 1980 and March 26, 1980. Interviews were carried out during the day hours and many have been followed up by telephone

4.0 FIELD PROGRAM (con't)

conversations. The people were aware of the project and were quite receptive to providing as much information as possible. Although none of the original driller's logs were available, the residents were generally able to complete the rest of the questionnaire without problems. A summary of the questionnaire findings are contained in Table 1 of this report.

Water samples were taken from three of the households during the water supply and sewage disposal survey. This limited amount of sampling was conducted to obtain only an approximation of the range in water quality. More extensive sampling was not considered to be necessary. All the water samples were obtained from the well via either a kitchen or work room tap. The findings of the Region's laboratory regarding its bacteriological examination and chemical analyses of the water samples are given in Table 2.

The Trow Group Ltd. of Hamilton, a soils consulting and testing firm, was retained to drill seven test holes. On March 27, 1980, using continuous flight auger equipment, the borings were advanced to bedrock or 20 feet (6.1 metres) whichever occurred first. Representative samples were recovered at regular intervals for the purpose of subsoil identification. Soil types for each test hole were logged as were the water table locations if encountered. In addition, standpipes were installed in each boring to enable measurement of a "stabilized" water level at a later date.

A 4-foot (1.2 metre) percolation test hole was put down adjacent to each soil boring. Due to the extremely wet ground conditions, percolation tests had to be postponed until mid-April 1980. The positioning of the test holes was generally intended to reflect the character of the different area soils for tile field installations. The corresponding test hole records and percolation test results are contained in the Trow Group Ltd. report in Appendix C.

TABLE 1.

SUMMARY OF WOODBURN
WATER SUPPLY AND WASTE DISPOSAL SURVEY

SECTION	PERSON CONTACTED AND PROPERTY LOCATION IN TOWNSHIP OF GLANBROOK			
	R. Mitchell	N. Kirby	B. Ridge	S. Legato
A) <u>Water Supply</u>	Block 2	Block 2	Block 1	(Binbrook Golf Club)
	Conc. 2 Lot 2	Conc. 2 Lot 1	Conc. 2 Lot 5	Block 1
				Conc. 2 Lot 3
<u>Date of Survey</u>	March 18, 1980	March 18, 1980	March 18, 1980	March 26, 1980
<u>Driller's Log</u>	---	---	---	---
<u>Type of Well</u>	Drilled (1)	Drilled	1) 1 drilled 2) 1 drilled 3) 1 hand-dug	Drilled
<u>Depth of Well</u>	25' (7.625 m)	27' (8.235 m)	1) By house 35' (10.675 m) 2) By barn 27'-28' (8.4 m) 3) By house 28' (8.54 m)	28'-35' (8.54 m - 10.675 m)
<u>Depth of Casing</u>	29' (8.845 m)	27' (8.235 m)	---	35' (10.675 m)
<u>Location of Screen</u> (if any)	No	No	No	No
<u>Diameter of Well</u>	6" (.153 m)	6" (.153 m)	1 and 2 6" (.153 m) 3 4' (1.22 m)	6" (.153 m)
<u>Aquifer Type and Depth</u>	Limestone 0025	Clay	---	---
<u>Static Water Level</u>	10'-12' (3.05 m - 3.66 m)	13'-14' (3.965 m - 4.27 m)	1) 15' (4.575 m) 2) 15' (4.575 m) 3) 15' (4.575 m)	4' (1.22 m)
<u>Pumping Water Level</u>	Negligible change	Negligible change	---	4' (1.22 m)

TABLE 1 (con't)

SECTION	PERSONS CONTACTED			
	R. Mitchell	N. Kirby	B. Ridge	S. Legato
A) Water Supply (con't)				
Pumping Rate	6 GPM (27.3 LPM)	4 GPM (18.2 LPM)	---	50 GPM (227.3 LPM)
Quality of Water	Hard (2)	Hard (1)	Good (1)	Sulphur (1)
Other Comments	1. Inside original hand-dug well 2. Softener necessary Sulphur below 30' (9.15 m)	1. Softener necessary	1. Sulphur experienced at depths greater than 30' (9.15 m)	1. Chlorinator and softener necessary Has holding tank

SECTION	PERSONS CONTACTED			
	R. Mitchell	N. Kirby	B. Ridge	S. Legato
B) Waste Disposal				
Type of Waste Disposal	Below grade field	Below grade field	2 below grade fields	Lagoon
No. of House Occupants	6	2	2 on each system	2 (800 person capacity)
Frequency of Maintenance	1 pump out a year	Pump out every 3-4 years	Never for north system 1 pump out every 3-4 years for south system	None
Problems	None	None	None	None

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF BACTERIOLOGICAL EXAMINATION
AND CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF WATER SAMPLES
WOODBURN STUDY AREA

Parameter	HOUSEHOLD SURVEYED			
	R. Mitchell Block 2	B. Ridge Block 1	S. Legato Binbrook Golf Club, Block 1	
	Conc. 2 Lot 2	Conc. 2 Lot 5	Conc. 2 Lot 3	
Total Coliform/100 ml.	182	46	0	
Fecal Coliform/100 ml.	0	13	0	
Ammonia (ppm)	0.04	0.02	0.17	
Nitrates (ppm)	2.6	2.3	ND	
Sulphates (ppm)	31	185	930	
Iron (ppm)	10	<.05	1.8	
pH	7.4	7.4	7.2	
Chloride (ppm)	16	4	5	
Total Hardness (ppm)	700	700	533	
Alkalinity (ppm)	356	408	359	
Total Dissolved				
Solids (ppm)	466	1046	1797	
Sulphur (ppm)	ND	ND	ND	

NOTE: ND = Not Detected

5.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION

5.1 Bedrock

From existing information, the bedrock within the Woodburn Study Area is a dolomitic limestone. The depth to the bedrock from ground surface appears to generally be greater than 20 feet (6.1 metres).

5.2 Soils

The primary soil type in the area is a clay till which is overlain by clay in the vicinity of Twenty Mile Creek. The interpreted extent of the till and clay are shown on Figure 1.

5.3 Topography

The topography of the Woodburn Study Area is flat-lying, with slopes generally less than 10% as illustrated on Figure 1.

5.4 Surficial Drainage

Poor internal soil drainage and the generally flat-lying topography, results in a high water table and surface ponding of water during heavy precipitation and spring run-off periods. Extensive areas adjacent to Twenty Mile Creek are also subject to flooding during these periods as illustrated by the draft floodline and the many surface drainage features plotted on Figure 1.

5.5 Groundwater

During the spring run-off and other extremely wet periods of the year a perched water table in the overburden soils can be expected with the water table levels near the ground surface over most of the area. The test drilling program associated with this study was carried out in mid-April 1980 and a high perched water table was recorded. During drier periods of the year this water table would be somewhat lower. However, due to the poor internal drainage of the soil, this water table may not vary significantly even during the drier time of the year.

The majority of homes in the area obtain their water supply from the limestone bedrock aquifer. The wells in the area are founded in and obtain water from the fractured limestone bedrock at depths ranging from 20 to 50 feet (6.1 to 15.25 metres) below ground surface. Water is generally found at the surface to within 10 to 15 feet (3.0 to 4.5 metres) of the surface of the fractured limestone bedrock. The static water level in the bedrock most often rises above the bedrock surface to within 10 to 20 feet (3.0 to 6.1 metres) of ground surface.

Existing water well data contained in Appendix D indicates that the aquifer yield potential of 10 to 20 gpm for individual wells is good. The potential for yields up to 50 gpm is only fair.

Two of the sampled well waters contained coliform bacteria, one of which also included fecal coliform bacteria. These wells should be disinfected with "Javex" or similar chlorine solution, pumped out and retested to confirm the water quality. Should this contamination condition persist, then the well(s) should be inspected to determine if surface water is gaining access or the well(s) should be replaced with a new one.

5.5 Groundwater (con't)

The nitrate, chloride, and ammonia contents are adequately low.

Iron concentration greater than 0.3 ppm causes iron staining and could promote iron bacteria growth which would affect the aesthetic quality of the water. One well had a very high iron content of 10 ppm. However, this is not a public health concern.

The hardness, alkalinity and total solids contents are high in two of the tested well waters. However, these levels are not considered to be sufficiently excessive and the only effect is that the water requires larger amounts of detergents or soap when washing.

The sulphate content of 930 ppm in one of the well waters exceeds the recommended maximum of 250 ppm. Drinking water supplies with a sulphate content greater than this level can cause a laxative effect to persons, particularly infrequent users. Although, persons using such a water supply on a regular basis can become acclimatized to the water, such a water supply should not be used in public places. The removal of sulphates from a water supply is very difficult and costly. Accordingly, where such a situation exists it is normally recommended that the well be sealed and a new supply obtained.

Although no hydrogen sulphide was detected in the tested water samples, there have been reports of hydrogen sulphide being present in some of the wells in Woodburn. When hydrogen sulphide is present in a water supply, it is aesthetically very objectionable, but can be readily removed through simple aeration.

5.5 Groundwater (con't)

Generally, it may be concluded that quite a wide range in ground water quality exists in Woodburn and the quality that would be obtained from a new well is not predictable.

5.6 Alternative Methods of Sewage Disposal

Alternative methods of sewage disposal have been considered, as discussed in Appendix E.

Due to the presence of a high watertable, and the low permeability of the native soils, extensive development in Woodburn is not recommended. Imported fill could be placed to create suitable areas for tile fields. Such installations should be sufficiently large to achieve percolation of the sewage into the underlying native soils. Alternatively, in areas where the water table is greater than 10 feet from the ground surface, the tile field should be constructed as a normal trench system in the native soils. The alternative type of tile field which incorporates storage of the sewage over the fall, winter and spring months and evapotranspiration during the growing season has been considered and rejected.

Generally, the Ontario climate is not suitable for the operation of a evapotranspiration type system due to the amount of precipitation that occurs. This option was accordingly rejected.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

A perched watertable exists in the clays and clay tills of the Woodburn Study Area, which is often at or near the ground surface. The permeability of these soils are approximately 10^{-7} cm/sec.

In most cases, the water chemistry is adequate for human consumption, but has the inconveniences of high hardness, iron and sulphate levels. On occasion these are accompanied by a hydrogen sulphide odour. In some instances, poor water quality within the study area has caused residents to have water delivered to their homes. Water containing sulphates in excess of 250 ppm can cause laxative effects, and is not recommended for human consumption. Contamination of well water, as evidenced by the presence of coliform bacteria is occurring in existing wells and should be corrected.

The above factors combined with the flooding characteristics of Twenty Mile Creek are the basis for the conclusion that extensive additional development of Woodburn should not be considered. However, some limited individual new development or upgrading of existing development could be considered for those areas located above the Twenty Mile Creek (draft) Regional floodline.

The tile field size and lot area required for a single family residence is as follows:

Daily Sewage Flow Design	300 gpd (1,360 Lpd)
Lineal Feet of Tile in Single Field	4,000 ft. (1,200 m)
Area for Single Field including 10-foot Buffer	31,500 sq.ft. (3,076 sq.m)
Recommended Area including Stand-by	57,000 sq.ft. (5,566 sq.m)

6.0 CONCLUSIONS (con't)

Implied Minimum Lot Size	250 ft. x 350 ft. (76.2 m x 106.7 m)
Implied Lot Size	2 acres (0.81 ha.)

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Individual private wells should continue to be utilized by existing and future residents. It must be recognized that not all residents will be successful in obtaining a water supply with acceptable chemical characteristics.
2. Individual private sewage disposal systems should be utilized for sewage disposal. In the case where the proposed lot is topographically high, relative to the location of the Twenty Mile Creek floodline, a normal tile field could be installed if the lot has a minimum buildable area of 2 acres (0.81 ha.).
3. Development within the designated flood plain of Twenty Mile Creek should not be permitted.
4. Infilling with single family residences could be considered, but Woodburn does not have the water quality nor the soil and ground water conditions that are considered necessary for its designation as a growth area.


7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS (con't)

5. Commercial, industrial or institutional land uses should be located in other areas where the site conditions are more favourable for the provision of individual private water supplies and sewage disposal systems

Respectfully submitted,



Karl Reichert, P. Eng.
Director, Environmental Engineering &
Assistant Branch Manager



Michael Brown, B.E.S.
Planner

APPENDIX A

STUDY TERMS OF REFERENCE



THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF
**HAMILTON
WENTWORTH**

December 14, 1979

File # R.555.3

Mr. Karl Reichart, P.Eng.,
Director
Environmental Engineering and
Assistant Branch Manager,
89 Carlingview Drive
Rexdale, Ontario
M9W 5E4

Dear Karl:

SUBJECT: Settlement Capability Studies
for Woodburn and Freelon

This letter is to advise that on December 4, 1979, Regional Council approved the recommendation to retain your firm to carry out the above noted studies.

You are hereby requested to commence the study and submit the details of the field work which require co-ordination with the local Municipal Councils and/or residents.

The Officials in the Area Municipalities of Glanbrook and Flamborough have been advised of the proposed studies and we will arrange the necessary meetings after receiving the details of the work program from your office.

Our solicitor will prepare the necessary agreement which will be forwarded to you in the near future.

Yours truly,

Mohammed Afsar, P.Eng.,
Senior Planner
Regional Planning Division.

MA;hk

November 20, 1979

Mr. M. Afsar, P. Eng.,
Senior Planner
Regional Planning Division
Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth
Planning and Development Department
100 Main Street East
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 1G8

Dear Mr. Afsar,

Re: Settlement Capability Study for:
Woodburn - Township of Glanbrook
Freelton - Township of Flamborough

Further to our letters of October 26, 1979, and our discussions on November 12 and 15, 1979, we have reviewed the scope of work and costs to carry out assessments of Woodburn and Freelton for further settlement development.

The revised proposal follows:

Scope of Work

1. Obtain recent additional information on new water wells from the MOE, analyze this data together with the data now in our files to determine the probable safe groundwater yield in the Woodburn and Freelton areas. Prepare a tabulation of all this data.
2. Obtain recent additional information on development proposals and new septic tank systems from the Health Department.
3. Review other relevant background information that may be available from the Conservation Authority, the Agricultural representative relating to land drainage, flooding, etc., within the study area. Prepare a summary of all background data.
4. Conduct a door to door survey of a number of homes, to obtain information on present water table elevations, water supply reliability, water samples for bacteriological examination and chemical analysis. It is anticipated that the samples would be analyzed by the Region's laboratory. Also obtain information on sewage disposal systems.


5. Utilizing well log information and available topographical plans of the area beyond the study area, determine the direction of groundwater flow and, if possible, the groundwater recharge area. It is important that the recharge areas close to the settlement be identified and protected from development that could affect the groundwater quality.
6. Retain a soils consulting and testing firm to construct a number of deep test holes to bedrock or 20 ft. whichever is greater. It is anticipated that approximately 12 holes would be put down in Woodburn and 6 holes in Freelon. Soil types for each test hole would be logged and also the water table location, if encountered. Due to expected soil type variability it will be necessary to enter on to private lands in Woodburn in order to place the test holes at representative locations. We would mark the test location on a plan and request that a Region of Hamilton-Wentworth representative contact the affected property owners to seek and obtain permission to enter on to the private property for soil testing. The resolution of access to the lands could be somewhat time consuming and impossible to judge when it could be completed. Accordingly, this proposal does not include the time associated with the securing of permission to enter on to the private lands.
7. Determine the susceptibility of ground and surface water to contamination from development located on the higher lands and along the existing watercourses. Assess the alternatives to protect these waters while permitting the development of the settlements. This aspect is particularly important in areas that may have a relatively shallow depth of overburden over the groundwater table or bedrock.
8. Determine the tile field requirements for different types of development, located in the different soils of the study area.
9. Determine the extent of development possible based on the use of individual groundwater or communal (Regionally owned) water supplies and on the identified aquifer potential.
10. Determine the minimum residential lot area that should be provided in the different near surface soil types, and provide recommendations on development density for residential development, and guidelines for commercial and industrial development, based on the sewage disposal system requirements.

Mr. M. Afsar
November 20, 1979
Page 3

11. Determine the ultimate development capability possible in the study area based on the use of individual private well water supplies and on communal or Regionally owned water systems. Prepare recommendations on the approach that should be followed during the construction of new housing to protect the tile field area from damage due to construction traffic.
12. Outline a monitoring program to determine when the development of an area is approaching its ultimate development capability.
13. Preparation of a report and plan for each settlement, review with the Client, amend and finalize, provide the Client with 50 copies of the report.

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTORY LETTER FROM REGION OF
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH
SIGNED PERMISSION FORMS



THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF
**HAMILTON
WENTWORTH**

February 15, 1980

File # R 555.3

Dear Property Owner:

On December 4, 1979, Regional Council approved a study of the development capability of the Woodburn Settlement Area. The purpose of the study is to determine if any more residential development can be permitted in Woodburn and where it should be permitted.

The Region has retained Underwood McLellan (1977) Ltd., as a Consultant to conduct this study. As part of the research the Consultant must ascertain soil and ground water characteristics of the lands under investigation by drilling tests on various properties. This procedure will be undertaken at no cost to you.

By this letter we wish to request your permission to permit our Consultant to enter your property to undertake the required tests. We trust that you will grant this permission so that the study may proceed.

The Consultant has scheduled testing for the last two weeks of March 1980. Upon receipt of the attached permission form you will be notified of the precise date when tests will be performed on your property. These tests should not result in any damage to your property. However, if there is any cause for claims the Consultant is fully responsible.

We attach a prepaid envelope and permission form. Please sign the form and return to our office.

We wish to thank you in advance for your co-operation. Should you wish to have additional information please do not hesitate to contact myself or Mr. J.L. Schwarz of my department. (Tel. 526-4178).

Yours very truly,

D.A. Lychak, M.C.I.P.
Commissioner
Planning and Development

TSB;hk

Planning and Development Department.
100 Main St., East, Hamilton, Ont. L8N 1G8

RECEIVED MAR 5 1980

P E R M I S S I O N

I hereby give the Consultant, Underwood McLellan (1977) Ltd. permission to enter my property for the purpose of test drilling. It is my understanding that the tests will not result in any damage to my property, and in the event that any damage be caused, the Consultant will assume responsibility.

DATED this day of 3 - MARCH 1980.

Motto Cresciani

RECEIVED FEB 20 1980

P E R M I S S I O N

I hereby give the Consultant, Underwood McLellan
(1977) Ltd. permission to enter my property for
the purpose of test drilling. It is my understanding
that the tests will not result in any damage to my
property, and in the event that any damage be
caused, the Consultant will assume responsibility.

DATED this *19th* day of *February* 1980.

Rene Mitchell

Please note that I rent the Vere
land from Mr. Vere and ~~and~~ that damage to crops
~~there~~ there would be compensable to me.

R.M.

file # 213

RECEIVED FEB 22 1980

P E R M I S S I O N

I hereby give the Consultant, Underwood McLellan (1977) Ltd. permission to enter my property for the purpose of test drilling. It is my understanding that the tests will not result in any damage to my property, and in the event that any damage be caused, the Consultant will assume responsibility.

DATED this 19th day of February 1980.

Louise A. Venn

bk 43

RECEIVED FEB 22 1980

P E R M I S S I O N

I hereby give the Consultant, Underwood McLellan (1977) Ltd. permission to enter my property for the purpose of test drilling. It is my understanding that the tests will not result in any damage to my property, and in the event that any damage be caused, the Consultant will assume responsibility.

DATED this 18th day of February 1980.

NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY LIMITED

John W. Mayo
MANAGER, REAL ESTATE

Agents for Mullis Kirby

1414

RECEIVED FEB 27 1980

P E R M I S S I O N

I hereby give the Consultant, Underwood McLellan (1977) Ltd. permission to enter my property for the purpose of test drilling. It is my understanding that the tests will not result in any damage to my property, and in the event that any damage be caused, the Consultant will assume responsibility.

DATED this 20 day of Feb. 1980.

Blair Ridge

104 546

RECEIVED MAR 5 1980

P E R M I S S I O N

I hereby give the Consultant, Underwood McLellan (1977) Ltd. permission to enter my property for the purpose of test drilling. It is my understanding that the tests will not result in any damage to my property, and in the event that any damage be caused, the Consultant will assume responsibility.

DATED this 7th day of Dec. 1980.

W. McLellan

APPENDIX C

THE TROW GROUP LIMITED REPORT
PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
AND
SEPTIC SUITABILITY STUDY
WOODBURN, ONTARIO



CONSULTING
ENGINEERS

The Trow Group Limited

HAMILTON BRANCH

P.O. BOX 430, STN. B, HAMILTON, ONTARIO, L8L 7W2
TELEPHONE (416) 560-3001

Project: H3290-G

April 24, 1980

Underwood McLellan Ltd.
c/o UMA Group
89 Carlingview Drive
Rexdale, Ontario
M9W 5E4

Attention: Mr. C. Anderson

Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation
and Septic Suitability Study
Woodburn, Ontario

Dear Sir,

The Trow Group Limited was retained to conduct a preliminary geotechnical investigation at the above noted site. The objective of this investigation was to present a general overview of the subsoil and ground water conditions prevailing at the site and comment generally on the suitability of these subsoils for sewage disposal using septic tile methods.

Seven (7) exploratory borings were put down at locations selected by a representative of Underwood McLellan Ltd. These borings were advanced to a maximum depth of 6.1 m (20 feet) on March 27, 1980 by Longyear Canada Incorporated under the direction and supervision of a representative of The Trow Group Limited. Representative samples were recovered at regular intervals for the purpose of subsoil identification and subsequent laboratory testing, if required, at a later date. In addition, a percolation test hole was put down adjacent to each boring as per the enclosed Drawing No. 2. An additional boring, originally designated as Borehole 1 had been specified, but could not be drilled due to severe access problems caused by overly wet conditions.

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY.
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

Project: H3290-G

2. 

Observations of the ground water were conducted in the open borings during the course of the fieldwork. In addition, standpipes were installed in each boring to enable measurement of a "stabilized" water level at a later date.

The borehole locations have been established by The UMA Group and are indicated on the enclosed Drawing 1.

SUBSOIL CONDITIONS

A review of published pedological studies for this area indicates that the subsoils in this area consists primarily of silty clays and clay tills associated with the Beverly and Binbrook series common to the eastern portions of the Wentworth County. The soils are moderately stone free and generally poor draining.

The borings put down at the site confirm this information. All of the borings encountered deposits of brown silty clay with occasional fine gravels. A relatively thin deposit of clayey silt till was also proven in one of the borings, Borehole 5, underlying this silty clay stratum. Refusal to augers was noted at fairly shallow depths in a number of the borings and was assumed to be the top of bedrock. Details of the subsoil are given on the Borehole Logs, Drawings 3 through 9.

The ground water levels were recorded several days after standpipe installation and are shown on the attached borehole logs and the attached Drawing No. 2.

SEPTIC TILE SUITABILITY

Percolation tests were conducted between April 19 and 20, 1980 following the method specified by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. In addition, all of the test holes were well saturated beyond the minimum recommended by the Ministry of the Environment as it had rained at the site over several days prior to testing. In addition, water was added to each test hole on a practically continuous basis for at least 48 hours before the tests were performed.

Project: H3290-G

3.





The results of the percolation tests are presented on Table No. 1, attached.

As can be seen from Table 1, it is obvious that the rate of water fall in all of the borings was extremely slow. This is assumed to be due in part to the impermeable nature of the subsoils encountered at this site, and the high water table noted in all of the test locations, i.e., the ground was extremely wet within 1 or 2 feet of the existing ground surface. The percolation rate for these locations, expressed as "t" values, is expected to be of the order of hundreds of minutes. As such, septic tile beds designed for the proposed subdivision will be required to be placed on raised beds, as recommended by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment.

We trust that this information is satisfactory for your purposes. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours very truly,
THE TROW GROUP LIMITED


M. H. MacKay, P. Eng.


D. Schebesch, P. Eng.

MHM/ml
Encl.
Dist: Underwood McLellan Ltd.
c/o UMA Group

(2)

Project: H3290-G




TABLE 1
PERCOLATION TEST RESULTS
WOODBURN, ONTARIO

TEST HOLE NO.	DATE (1980)	TIME	DEPTH TO WATER LEVEL
1	April 19	2:10 pm	12-11/16"
		4:58 pm	12-7/8"
	April 20	10:37 am	13-3/8"
		1:55 pm	13-1/2"
2	April 19	2:45 pm	18-5/16"
		6:00 pm	18-1/4"
	April 20	10:45 am	18-1/4"
		2:10 pm	18-3/8"
3	April 19	2:20 pm	22-1/2"
		5:37 pm	22-1/2"
	April 20	11:02 am	22-1/2"
		2:41 pm	22-1/2"
4	April 19	3:00 pm	13-3/4"
		5:48 pm	13-7/8"
	April 20	10:41 am	14-7/8"
		2:02 pm	15-3/8"
5	April 19	2:30 pm	17"
		5:27 pm	17-1/4"
	April 20	11:05 am	19-1/4"
		2:53 pm	19-5/8"
6	April 19	2:00 pm	14-1/16"
		5:17 pm	14-3/4"
	April 20	10:52 am	14-1/4"
		2:26 pm	14-1/4"
7	April 19	2:40 pm	18-1/4"
		5:09 pm	18-5/8"
	April 20	11:13 am	19-7/8"
		3:08 pm	20" even

NOTES:

Slight rain during night may have affected readings slightly.


All readings made to top of perforated pipe.



LEGEND

 BOREHOLE

NOT TO SCALE



Percolation Test Hole No.	Dimension			
	a	b	c	
1	8"	4'4"	1'5"	
2	8-3/4"	4'4 1/4"	1'1 1/4"	
3	12-1/4"	4'0 1/4"	0'7"	
4	10-1/4"	4'0 1/4"	0'9 1/8"	
5	10-3/4"	4'0 1/4"	1'11"	
6	8"	4'6"	1'5"	
7	11"	4'1"	1'3"	

BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 1

DRAWING No. 3

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision
LOCATION Woodburn
Ontario

AUGER SAMPLE

SPT (N) VALUE

DYNAMIC CONE TEST

SHELBY TUBE

FIELD VANE TEST

LAB VANE TEST

NATURAL MOISTURE

PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT

UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT OVERBURDEN PRESSURE

% STRAIN AT FAILURE

PENETROMETER

HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE
DRAWING NO. 1

LAB VANE TEST

G W L	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTERBERG LIMITS % DRY WEIGHT			NATURAL WEIGHT t/m ³
					20	40	60	80				
					SHEAR STRENGTH MPa							
									10	20	30	
	2	60 cm TOPSOIL & organic material		0								
		SILTY CLAY-brown becoming grey trace of organic stainings, occ. fine gravel,stiff,moist		1								
				2								
				3								
				4								
				5								
				6								
				7								
				8								
				9								
				10								
		TERMINATED										
		NOTES:										
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equip- ment by Longyear Canada Incor- porated on March 27, 1980.										
		2. Water Level Records										
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN										
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)										
		on										
		completion dry 6.1										
		April 16/80 0.5 ---										

BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 2

DRAWING No. 4

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision

LOCATION Woodburn
Ontario

HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE
DRAWING NO. 1

AUGER SAMPLE
SPT (N) VALUE

DYNAMIC CONE TEST

SHELBY TUBE

FIELD VANE TEST

LAB VANE TEST

NATURAL MOISTURE
PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT

UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT
OVERBURDEN PRESSURE
% STRAIN AT FAILURE
PENETROMETER

G L W	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV. m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTERBERG LIMITS % DRY WEIGHT			NATURAL UNIT WEIGHT t/m ³
					20	40	60	80	10	20	30	
		45 cm of organic soil & plant material, FIELD in FALLOW		0								
		SILTY CLAY-brown becoming grey with increased depth, trace of sand in thin seams or partings, occ. fine gravel, moist to wet		1								
				2								
				3								
				4								
				5								
				6								
				7								
				8								
				9								
				10								
		REFUSAL TO AUGERS ON ASSUMED BEDROCK SURFACE										
		NOTES:										
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equipment by Longyear Canada Incorporated on March 27, 1980.										
		2. Water Level Records										
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN										
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)										
		on completion dry 5.48										
		April 16/80 0.23 ---										



BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 3

DRAWING No. 5

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision AUGER SAMPLE ☒ NATURAL MOISTURE ☒
 LOCATION Woodburn SPT (N) VALUE ☐ PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT ☐
Ontario DYNAMIC CONE TEST ☐ UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT ☐
 FIELD VANE TEST ☐ OVERBURDEN PRESSURE ☐
 LAB VANE TEST ☐ % STRAIN AT FAILURE ☐
 HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE PENETROMETER ☐
 DRAWING NO. 1

LWG	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTERING LIMITS UNIT WEIGHT			NATURAL UNIT WEIGHT t/m ³
					20	40	60	80	10	20	30	
		60 cm TOPSOIL & ORGANIC MATERIAL rootlets, plant fibre, etc.		0								
		SILTY CLAY-light brown to grey, trace of sand and fine gravel, stiff, moist to wet		1								
				2								
				3								
				4								
				5								
				6								
				7								
				8								
				9								
				10								
		REFUSAL TO AUGERS ON ASSUMED BEDROCK SURFACE										
		NOTES										
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equip- ment by Longyear Canada Incor- porated on March 27, 1980.										
		2. Water Level Records										
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN										
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)										
		on dry 5.8										
		completion surface ---										
		April 16/80										



BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 4

DRAWING No. 6

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision
LOCATION Woodburn
Ontario

AUGER SAMPLE
SPT (N) VALUE
DYNAMIC CONE TEST
SHELBY TUBE
FIELD VANE TEST
LAB VANE TEST

☐ ☐ ☒
☐ ☐ ☐
☐ ☐ ☐
☐ ☐ ☐
☐ ☐ ☐
☐ ☐ ☐

NATURAL MOISTURE
PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT
UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT
OVERBURDEN PRESSURE
% STRAIN AT FAILURE
PENETROMETER

HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE
DRAWING NO. 1

G W L	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTERING LIMITS BY WEIGHT			NATURAL UNIT WEIGHT t/m ³
					20	40	60	80	10	20	30	
		45 cm TOPSOIL & ORGANICS, rootlets, plant fibres (FIELD IN FALLOW)		0								
		SILTY CLAY-light brown to grey, occ. sand in upper zones, trace of fine gravel, stiff, moist to wet		1								
				2								
				3								
		CLAYEY SILT TILL-grey, fine to med. gravel, shale fragments, dense, moist		4								
		REFUSAL TO AUGERS ON ASSUMED BEDROCK SURFACE		5								
		NOTES		6								
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equip- ment by Longyear Canada Incor- porated on March 27, 1980.		7								
		2. Water Level Records		8								
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN		9								
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)		10								
		on completion 3.8 4.6										
		April 16/80 surface ---										



BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 5

DRAWING No. 7

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision AUGER SAMPLE ☒ NATURAL MOISTURE ☒
 LOCATION Woodburn SPT (N) VALUE ☐ PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT ☐
Ontario DYNAMIC CONE TEST ☐ UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT ☐
 FIELD VANE TEST ☒ OVERBURDEN PRESSURE ☒
 LAB VANE TEST ☒ % STRAIN AT FAILURE ☒
 HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE ☒ PENETROMETER ☒
 DRAWING NO. 1

FW	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTENDING LIMITS BY WEIGHT			NATURAL UNIT WEIGHT t/m ³
					SHEAR STRENGTH MPa				10	20	30	
		45 cm TOPSOIL & ORGANIC MATERIAL plant, fibres, rootlets, etc.		0								
		SILTY CLAY TO CLAYEY SILT- brown, grey to grey, till-like with increased depth, fine to medium gravel, trace of sand in upper levels, compact to dense, moist to wet		1								
				2								
				3								
				4								
				5								
				6								
		TERMINATED		7								
		NOTES		8								
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equip- ment by Longyear Canada Incor- porated on March 26, 1980.		9								
		2. Water Level Records		10								
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN										
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)										
		on completion dry 6.1										
		Apr. 16/80 0.64 ---										



BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 6

DRAWING No. 8

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision

LOCATION Woodburn

Ontario

HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE
DRAWING NO. 1

AUGER SAMPLE

SPT (N) VALUE

DYNAMIC CONE TEST

SHELBY TUBE

FIELD VANE TEST

LAB VANE TEST

NATURAL MOISTURE

PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT

UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT
OVERBURDEN PRESSURE

% STRAIN AT FAILURE

PENETROMETER

G W L	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTERBERG LIMITS % DRY WEIGHT			NATURAL UNIT WEIGHT t/m ³
					20	40	60	80	10	20	30	
		60 cm TOPSOIL & organic material		0								
		SILTY CLAY-brown becoming grey trace of organic stainings, occ. fine gravel, stiff, moist		1								
				2								
				3								
				4								
				5								
		TERMINATED		6								
		NOTES:		7								
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equip- ment by Longyear Canada Incor- porated on March 27, 1980.		8								
		2. Water Level Records		9								
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN		10								
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)										
		on wet cave 4.9										
		completion April 16/80 0.25 ---										



BOREHOLE LOG

JOB No. H3290-G

BOREHOLE No. 7

DRAWING No. 9

PROJECT Proposed Subdivision
LOCATION Woodburn
Ontario

AUGER SAMPLE
SPT (N) VALUE

○ ○

DYNAMIC CONE TEST

SHELBY TUBE

● ●

FIELD VANE TEST

+ s

LAB VANE TEST

t

NATURAL MOISTURE
PLASTIC AND LIQUID LIMIT

x
— 0

UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL AT
OVERBURDEN PRESSURE

15 0 5
10

% STRAIN AT FAILURE
PENETROMETER

▲

HOLE LOCATION AND DATUM SEE
DRAWING NO. 1

LWG	SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	ELEV m	DEPTH m	N VALUE (ASTM D1586-CSA A119.1)				NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT AND ATTERING LIMITS BY WEIGHT			NATURAL UNIT WEIGHT t/m ³
					20	40	60	80	10	20	30	
		GOLF COURSE		0								
		60 cm TOPSOIL with organic stained soil										
		SILTY CLAY-brown becoming grey, occ. fine gravel, slightly sandy in seams, stiff becoming soft with depth, moist to wet		1								
				2								
				3								
				4								
				5								
				6								
		TERMINATED		7								
		NOTES:		8								
		1. Borehole advanced uncased using continuous flight auger equipment by Longyear Canada Incorporated on March 27, 1980.		9								
		2. Water Level Records		10								
		ELAPSED DEPTH TO HOLE OPEN										
		TIME W.L. (m) TO (m)										
		on completion dry 6.1										
		April 16/80 0.4 ---										



APPENDIX D

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING WELLS - WOODBURN

APPENDIX 'D'

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING WELLS - WOODBURN STUDY AREA

TOWNSHIP OF GLANBROOK

REGION OF HAMILTON-WENTWORTH

WELL NO.	LOCATION		STATIC		PUMP LEVEL		TEST RATE		DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH		WELL LOG		OTHER COMMENTS
	CONC LOT	WATER FOUND	FEET	WATER LEVEL	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND					
1	1 3	32	12	30	3	Tps1	0005	0015	0021	0035			
						Brwn clay							
						Blue clay							
						Lmsn							
2	1 4	40	5	20	20	Tps1	0001	0015	0034	0041			
						Brwn clay							
						Clay bldr							
						Lmsn							
3	1 4	30	10	30	4	Clay	0021	0035					
						Lmsn							
4	1 4	40	10	20	10	Brwn clay	0004	0030	0045				
						Blue clay bldr							
						Lmsn							
5	1 5	32	8	18	10	Brwn clay	0009	0018	0045				
						Blue clay							
						Lmsn							

LOCATION			STATIC		WELL LOG				OTHER	
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	FORMATIONS EXTEND		COMMENTS	
CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM					
6	1	5	33	12	17	Clay		0018		
						Bldr		0020		
						Lmsn		0030		
7	1	5	32	15	10	Tpsl		0001		
						Brwn clay		0016		
						Grey clay		0029		
						Lmsn		0032		
8	1	5	33	18	17	Clay		0023		
						Lmsn		0033		
9	1	5	32	8	10	Brwn clay		0010		
						Blue clay		0018		
						Lmsn		0032		
10	1	5	28	10	5	Clay		0015		
						Shle		0020		
						Grvl		0026		
						Grey lmsn		0030		
11	1	5	23	9	19	Brwn clay		0010		
						Grey clay		0014		
						Grey lmsn		0024		
12	1	5	22	10	12	Blue clay		0018		
						Lmsn		0030		

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER		
	CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND	COMMENTS		
13	1 5	26	10	26	7	Tpsl	0004		
						Blue clay	0025		
						Shle	0026		
14	1 5	33	16	25	12	Clay	0027		
						Lmsn	0035		
15	1 5	30	14	21	20	Brwn clay	0010		
						Stns	0012		
						Grey lmsn	0031		
16	2 3	30	6	15	20	Brwn clay	0010		
						Blue clay	0021		
						Brwn lmsn	0032		
17	2 3	27	15	18	20	Brwn clay	0010		
						Blue clay	0019		
						Lmsn	0029		
18	2 3	26	22	25	8	Brwn clay	0022		
						Blue clay bldr	0024		
						Grey lmsn	0036		
19	2 4	30	12	15	5	Clay	0024		
						Lmsn	0032		
20	2 4	36	7	28	2,	Brwn clay	0010		
						Grey clay	0020		
						Grey lmsn	0038		

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL.	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER		
CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND	COMMENTS		
21	2 4	32	8	15	10	Blue clay	0020		
						Grey lmsn	0033		
22	2 5	20	6	10	15	Clay	0018		
						Lmsn	0020		
23	2 5	26	16	20	13	Clay	0020		
						Lmsn	0028		
24	2 5	40	10	15	30	Tpsl	0006		
						Brwn clay	0020		
						Blue clay	0038		
						Grvl	0042		
25	2 3	28	15	25	10	Brwn clay	0019		
						Blue clay	0026		
						Grey shle	0028		
26	2 3	30	15	20	3	Tpsl	0003		
						Grvl stns	0028		
						Lmsn	0030		
27	2 3	39	8	25	25	Brwn clay	0017		
						Grey clay	0028		
						Grey lmsn	0041		
28	2 3	37	15	30	10	Brwn clay	0010		
						Blue clay stns	0033		
						Lmsn	0038		

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH		OTHER	
CONC LOT		FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS	EXTEND	COMMENTS	
29	2 3	32	15	20	10	Brwn clay	0020		
						Blue clay	0028		
						Blue clay grvl	0030		
						Grey lmsn	0032		
30	2 4	35	10	12	17	Clay	0032		
						Lmsn	0035		
31	2 5	40	25	27	17	Clay	0039		
						Shle	0040		
32	2 5	40	24	25	17	Clay	0039		
						Lmsn	0040		
33	2 5	36	16	17	16	Clay bldr	0035		
						Shle	0036		
34	2 5	22	4	14	10	Clay stns	0014		
						Shle	0017		
						Lmsn	0026		
35	2 5	23	6	14	9	Brwn clay	0014		
						Grey lmsn	0024		
36	2 5	30	7	20	25	Brwn clay	0014		
						Grey clay	0022		
						Grey lmsn	0030		

LOCATION				STATIC				WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	FEET	PUMP LEVEL	FEET	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER		
CONC LOT	2	5	20	6	10	17	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND	COMMENTS		
37	2	5	20	6	10	17	17	Clay	0010		
								Grvl	0013		
								Shle	0016		
								Lmsn	0020		
38	2	5	25	10	15	6	6	Clay	0022		
								Hpan	0023		
								Lmsn	0025		
39	2	5	33	18	18	17	17	Clay	0018		
								Shle	0019		
								Lmsn	0033		
40	2	5	33	18	20	17	17	Clay	0017		
								Shle	0018		
								Lmsn	0033		
41	2	5	25	15	25	20	20	Brwn clay	0020		
								Lmsn	0030		
42	2	5	30	10	20	10	10	Brwn clay	0008		
								Blue clay	0022		
								Lmsn	0030		
43	2	5	25	12	18	17	17	Clay	0015		
								Msnd clay grvl	0022		
								Lmsn	0026		

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER		
CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND	COMMENTS		
44	2 5	27	16	18	9	Brwn clay	0017		
45	2 5	19	10	15	13	Grey clay	0020		
46	2 5	38	22	25	10	Grey lmsn	0028		
47	2 5	35	18	23	13	Clay	0016		
48	2 5	22	8	20	10	Lmsn	0021		
49	2 5	23	12	20	10	Brwn clay	0030		
50	2 5	31	11	18	10	Blue clay	0038		
51	2 5	41	7	26	11	Blue lay stns	0039		
						Grey lmsn	0015		
						Blue clay	0018		
						Blue lay stns	0024		
						Grey lmsn	0036		
						Brwn clay	0010		
						Blue clay	0022		
						Clay	0020		
						Lmsn	0024		
						Brwn clay	0018		
						Blue clay	0023		
						Lmsn	0031		
						Brwn tpsl	0002		
						Brwn clay	0014		
						Grey clay	0040		
						Grey lmsn	0042		
							Sulphur		
							Water		

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER		
CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND	COMMENTS		
52	2	5	28	15	25	10	Clay	0018	
							Clay stns	0023	
							Lmsn	0030	
53	2	5	31	11	18	10	Brwn clay	0018	
							Blue clay	0023	
							Lmsn	0031	
54	2	5	23	11	14	13	Brwn tpsl msnd stns	0010	
							Blue clay	0022	
							Grey lmsn	0025	
55	2	5	25	15	15	15	Tpsl	0008	
							Brwn clay	0011	
							Grey clay	0018	
							Rock	0026	
BLOCK II									
56	1	7	30	17	28	15	Brwn tpsl	0001	
							Brwn clay	0016	
							Blue clay bldr	0023	
							Lmsn	0030	
57	1	1	31	19	21	10	Clay	0026	
							Lmsn	0031	

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH		OTHER	
CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS	EXTEND	COMMENTS	
58	1	1	29	4	14	25	Tpsl clay	0002	
							Brwn clay stns	0008	
							Grey clay stns	0012	
							Blue clay	0026	
							Blue clay lmsn	0029	
							Grey lmsn	0032	
59	1	1	30	18	17	17	Clay	0028	
							Lmsn	0030	
60	1	1	26	14	16	17	Clay	0021	
							Grvl bldr	0023	
							Lmsn	0026	
61	1	1	15	15	20	3	Brwn clay	0033	
							Lmsn	0034	
62	1	1	31	16	18	17	Clay	0029	
							Lmsn	0031	
63	1	1	24	16	16	17	Clay	0020	
							Lmsn	0029	
64	1	1	23	16	18	8	Clay	0020	
							Lmsn	0023	
65	1	1	32	20	25	10	Brwn clay	0012	
							Blue clay	0021	
							Lmsn	0035	

LOCATION				STATIC			WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTH IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER			
CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS-EXTEND	COMMENTS			
66	1 1	35	22	23	15	Blue clay	0031			
		41				Grey shle	0032			
						Lmsn	0041			
67	1 1	38	20	34	25	Brwn clay	0010			
		42				Grey clay	0024			
						Lmsn	0026			
68	1 1	29	15	22	13	Clay	0025			
						Lmsn	0030			
69	1 1	36	10	14	5	Clay	0029			
						Lmsn	0036			
70	1 1	26	10	12	17	Clay	0024			
						Lmsn	0036			
71	1 2	29	7	14	15	Brwn clay	0012			
						Blue clay	0014			
						Brwn lmsn	0031			
72	1 2	27	12	11	10	Brwn clay	0016			
						Grey lmsn	0028			
73	1 2	36	15	18	7	Clay	0017			
						Lmsn	0037			
74	1 2	29	20	20	10	Clay	0024			
						Lmsn	0029			

LOCATION				STATIC		WELL LOG			
WELL NO.	BLOCK	1	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	OTHER	
		CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM	FORMATIONS EXTEND	COMMENTS	
75	1	2	24	8	18	10	Clay	0017	
							Lmsn	0026	
76	1	3	38	10	15	10	Blue clay	0022	
							Grey lmsn	0045	
77	1	3	30	15	25	5	Brwn clay	0019	
							Lmsn	0032	
78	1	3	27	10	28	10	Clay	0021	
							Lmsn	0030	
79	2	1	31	15	22	17	Clay	0022	
							Lmsn	0031	
80	2	1	42	16	20	17	Clay	0040	
							Grvl shle	0042	
81	2	1	35	20	32	3	Brwn clay	0010	
							Blue clay	0025	
							Lmsn	0037	
82	2	1	40	18	25	20	Brwn clay	0006	
							Blue clay	0038	
							Shle	0040	
83	2	1	30	12	15	10	Clay	0018	
							Lmsn	0030	

LOCATION			STATIC			WELL LOG			OTHER
WELL NO.	BLOCK	I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH	FORMATIONS EXTEND	
CONC	LOT		FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM			COMMENTS
84	2	2	22	8	12	20	Tpsl	0004	
							Brwn clay	0020	
							Grey shle	0022	
							Grey lmsn	0024	
85	2	1	35	16	25	18	Tpsl	0002	35 Fresh
			42				Brwn clay	0012	Water
							Grey clay	0040	42 Sulphur
							Grey lmsn	0042	Water
86	2	1	46	16	30	17	Clay	0044	
							Shle	0046	
87	2	1	45	16	30	20	Brwn clay	0044	Sulphur
							Grvl	0045	Water
88	2	1	44	18	20	17	Clay	0039	Sulphur
							Lmsn	0044	Water
89	2	1	24	18	20	5	Clay	0015	
							Lmsn	0025	
90	2	1	22	16	22	5	Brwn clay	0016	
							Lmsn	0024	
91	2	1	24	10	8	10	Tpsl	0003	
							Brwn clay bdlr	0019	
							Grey-grvl	0026	

WELL NO.	LOCATION		STATIC		WELL LOG		
	BLOCK I	WATER FOUND	WATER LEVEL	PUMP LEVEL	TEST RATE	DEPTHS IN FEET TO WHICH FORMATIONS EXTEND	OTHER COMMENTS
	CONC LOT	FEET	FEET	FEET	GPM		
92	2 1	43	17	17	17	Clay	0042
93	2 1	23	10	10	30	Shle	0043
						Tpsl	0005
						Blue clay	0018
94	2 1	23	8	13	25	Lmsn	0025
						Tpsl	0003
						Brwn clay	0014
95	2 1	20	10	20	5	Grey shle	0023
						Clay	0018
96	2 2	32	8	25	20	Lmsn	0030
						Clay	0028
97	2 2	38	15	20	10	Lmsn	0035
						Brwn clay	0014
98	2 2	28	8	15	5	Grey lmsn	0039
						Brwn clay	0020
99	2 3	21	4	18	8	Lmsn	0028
						Brwn clay	0015
						Lmsn	0021

APPENDIX E

ALTERNATIVE ON-SITE SYSTEMS

ALTERNATIVE ON-SITE SYSTEMS

In determining whether an area is capable of sustaining future residential development, an important criteria is water consumption. For instance, if water conservation systems such as low water use toilets were employed to reduce water consumption, the required tile field size could be reduced.

Four such toilets have been considered including the "Flush-O-Matic", "Mansfield", "Microphor" and "International Water Saver Toilets Inc.". The Flush-O-Matic only uses about 1 quart of water for each flush. However, this toilet does not have a trap and as such does not meet the Ontario Plumbing Code regulations for installation in a residence. The Mansfield toilet requires 3 quarts per flush. However, we have been advised the unit has not proved to be reliable and plumbing suppliers are hesitant to market the unit. The Microphor toilet requires an auxillary air supply from a small air compressor. Only 3 quarts of water are required for each flush. However, due to the need to install an air compressor in each residence and the lack of a trap that meets the Ontario Plumbing code, we have rejected this unit. The International Water Saver Toilets Inc. toilet operates on a pre-charged air pressure tank and in this way it is possible to use only one gallon per flush. This particular toilet has just been introduced and will shortly be tested in a new development in Waterloo.

A. Reduction in Water Consumption

Changes to the shower heads, use of aerators on the nozzle of all taps, purchase of sud saver type washing machines cannot be legislated or reasonably controlled. Accordingly, it must be concluded that the only satisfactory changes are those which the occupant cannot interfere with. Components such as pressure reducing valves on the service connection and possibly the installation of a pre-charged pressure tank type toilet would seem to offer the best chance of long term success with an overall water saving of 10 to 15 pgcd. This amount may appear to be small, but can significantly reduce the size and cost of the sewage disposal system.

B. Individual Private Sewage Disposal Systems

A number of individual private systems are available and could be considered in comparison to the standard septic tank and tile field.

(i) Class 6 Systems

A proprietary type plant that includes an effluent sand filter that will effluent discharge to a raised tile field would be considered as a Class 6 system.

These plants require regular attention by a skilled operator as the plant relies on both the maintenance of a biological system for the degradation of organics and a filter for the removal of most of the suspended solids before being discharged to the tile field. The plant process is identical to most municipal plants that is many times larger than the household unit, daily operator attention is required to maintain a suitable environment for the varied cultures of micro-organisms. Because of this operational need, generally the biological portion of the household plant does not function well except to the extent that the sewage is aerated. Accordingly, depending on the useful life of the sand filter the effluent discharged to the tile field will have most of the solids removed.

(ii) Raised Tile Field

A number of variations exist concerning the construction of the tile field to receive the effluent from a standard septic tank or other treatment facility. The field can be constructed to achieve partial disposal of the sewage by percolation into the native soil, storage of the effluent during the late fall, winter and early spring and evapotranspiration during the grass growing season.

(ii) Raised Tile Field (con't)

A raised field can be a suitable alternative in soils having a permeability greater than 10^{-5} cm/sec as the native soils are adequate to achieve percolation of the sewage into the ground. Also, in areas where there is a high water table, a raised tile field can increase the distance between the distribution tiles and the water table. A raised tile field is normally not as effective for effluent disposal as the opportunity for percolation in the horizontal direction is reduced. Accordingly, a greater amount of care is required in the construction of the raised field through deep ploughing of the underlying native soils. Also, it would be necessary to ensure that the sewage has been adequately treated before it reaches the native soils to ensure that a micro-biological growth build-up on the soil particularly does not occur which would inhibit the percolation process.

(iii) Pressurized Tile Fields

Some success has been achieved in clay type low permeable soils where tile field systems have failed through the use of a pressurized tile field system. In one instance in North Carolina, an existing housing development with relatively small lots has almost 100% failure of the standard tile field as evidenced through effluent ponding on the ground surface. The community was served with a communal water supply.

An experimental tile field was constructed. Perforated plastic piping 1 1/2 inches to 2 inches in diameter was installed in trenches with an 18-inch spacing throughout the entire yard. The piping was placed level at about 1.5 feet below ground surface. Native backfill was replaced in the trench with no sand or gravel

(iii) Pressurized Tile Fields (con't)

being used. A small pump well was constructed to receive the effluent from the septic tank and pump it into the tile field. The tile field layout was designed so that a pipe from the far end of the field would return excess sewage flows to the pump well. A pressure reducing valve set at 2 to 3 psi maintained a backpressure on the tile field. The tile runs were in the order of 2,000 linear feet. This system reportedly has worked well and ponding is no longer a problem. On examination of the system, it appears that with the small tile run spacing and the use of native materials as the backfill, that the system has achieved equal distribution of the septic tank effluent over the entire field area.

Also, with the warm water weather that prevails in North Carolina the sewage is being removed by evapotranspiration almost all year round. For this reason, this type of system would not be feasible at our latitude.

(iv) Compost Toilet

Some European countries utilize composting toilets for disposal of the "black" water. The "grey" water is treated separately in a septic tank and tile field. A composting toilet has the advantage that no water is used and the per capita water consumption for other domestic uses is reduced to about 25 gpcd. The composting toilet requires normally that the washroom be located on an outside wall of the house and on the first floor. The toilet and composting tank are an integral unit and the compost is removed for land disposal every few months. There have been many operational difficulties with these toilets and it has been necessary to install heating elements to evaporate off the excess amounts of water. This evaporation process would be expected to produce objectionable odors and is considered to be wasteful of electrical energy.

(v) Incineration

The "Incinolet" toilet has been available in Ontario for a number of years. All wastes are electrically incinerated as an ash. The unit will function provided it is not overloaded as when this happens the heating element is insufficient to achieve rapid burning of the waste."

All water is released as steam. Due to the necessary drying of the waste before incineration can take place these units have created objectionable odors. These units would not be recommended for installation.

(vi) Reuse System

A number of experimental plants have been installed in the U.S. to receive all sewage from a single household into a Class 6 type plant.

In one test, the effluent after filtration was disinfected with iodine and used in a greenhouse. The pea gravel filter produced an effluent BOD and suspended solids of 3 ppm. It was claimed that the water after having been filtered in a charcoal filter could be re-cycled to flush toilets and for lawn watering. However, it is still necessary to discharge a portion of the effluent from the greenhouse irrigation system. This system apparently functioned well. The plant construction cost is about \$7,000 U.S. (1979) and to this must be added the greenhouse cost. Because the effluent is well treated and after being used as irrigation water, it would be expected that the BOD would be very low and that the nutrients would be effectively removed.

(vi) Reuse System (con't)

However, we would be concerned about the continued effective operation of such a system installed to serve each premise. Also, it would not be practical to construct a plant and greenhouse for each building or group of buildings. In addition, the greenhouse would have to be heated during the winter as solar heat would not be adequate.

The Thetford Corporation is now marketing a reuse plant under the name "Cycle-Let" and now has a number of installations at service stations and industrial plants. The plant provides biological treatment, settling, ultra filter membrane filtrations and activated carbon absorption with ultra violet or ozone disinfection. The plant, to date, has been used for the recycle of water to toilets. In all instances low water use type toilets have been employed. The cost of this plant is quite high at \$40,000 U.S. (1979) to treat approximately 100 gpd. Due to the high cost we would not recommend this plant unless the cost of alternative systems was greater.

(vii) Recycle System

The Pure Cycle Corporation in Boulder Colorado has a recycle plant. The treatment unit includes a rotating biological contactor followed by settling and filtration through ultra filter membranes, activated carbon absorption, cation and anion exchange and disinfection with ultra violet light. The plant is pre-charged with approximately 1,200 gallons of water and after treatment is stored in a clean water holding tank. The water is used for all domestic needs and reportedly meets all standards respecting water purity requirements.

(vii) Recycle System (con't)

It is necessary that the process be complete recycle, as the treatment plant deionizing system is capable of removing only a fixed amount of chemicals each day. No information is available respecting virus removal. The plant cost is \$10,000 U.S. (1979) plus a monthly service charge of \$30.00. To this must be added the cost of electricity to operate the plant which would be approximately \$12.00 per month.

Assuming the plant does meet all requirements for full recycle social acceptance may be difficult to achieve.

(viii) Holding Tank

A holding tank could be installed for each building or group of buildings with the contents being trucked to one of the Region's sewage treatment plants. Due to the excessive haulage cost that would result if this method of disposal were adopted, this alternative would only be recommended if the majority of buildings could be served with an on-site disposal system and a holding tank was required for a very small number of existing buildings.

